REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for indicating that the drawings filed on July 30, 2003, are accepted by Examiner.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-11 were pending in the present application. Claims 2 and 6-11 are cancelled (without prejudice or disclaimer) and claims 12-32 are newly added by way of this reply. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 are now pending. Claims 1, 26, 28, and 31 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 26, 28, and 31.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to clarify the invention and address the informalities noted by the Examiner. Further, claims 3-5 are also amended to address informalities noted by the Examiner and to maintain consistency with amended claim 1, from which claims 3-5 depend. No new matter is introduced by these amendments as support may be found, for example, at paragraphs [0222]-[0249], paragraphs [0276]-[0285], and Figures 7-11 of the published application.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-11 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 2 and 6-11 are cancelled and the objection is therefore moot with regard to claims 2 and 6-11. Claims 1 and 3-5 are amended to address the informalities pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Claims 2, 6-9, and 11 are cancelled and the rejection is therefore moot with regard to claims 2, 6-9, and 11. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 11 are amended to address the indefinite issues pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed toward non-statutory matter. By way of this reply, claims 2 and 6-11 are cancelled and the rejection is therefore moot with regard to claims 2 and 6-11. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected as not falling into a statutory category, which is one of machine, manufacture, process, or composition of matter, as pointed out by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 3-5 are amended by way of this reply to be directed to a method, which falls under one of the statutory categories (*i.e.*, the process). Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,671,714 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Weyer"). Claim 10 is cancelled by way of this replay and, therefore, the rejection is now moot with regard to claim 10. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 8-9, and 11

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weyer in view of RFC 1738 – Uniform Resource Locators (URL) (hereinafter referred to as "RFC 1738"). Claims 2, 8-9 and 11 are cancelled by way of this replay and, therefore, the rejection is now moot with regard to claims 2, 8, 9, and 11. To the extent this rejection still applies to amended claims 1 and 3-5, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The instant application discloses a method of identifying an individual in an Internet connected application and organizing data in an associated profile retrieved from a web page using Internet http addressing, the Internet http addressing being based on the identity of the individual. Amended independent claim 1 requires, in part:

(a) inputting the first URL name, the second URL name, and the third URL name into the Internet connected application to obtain an inputted first URL name, an inputted second URL name, and an inputted third URL name,

(b) extracting at least one identity of the first individual based on the third level domain names and the second level domain names of the inputted first URL name, and the inputted second URL name, and

(c) organizing the first profile, the second profile, and the third profile according to the at least one identity in the Internet connected application. *See, e.g.,* paragraphs [277]-[285] of the instant application.

Turning to the rejection, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "[f]irst, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (MPEP § 2143). Further, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." (MPEP § 2143.03).

Weyer teaches a method of **assigning** URL to members of a group. Weyer is completely silent with regard to the elements (a), (b), and/or (c) above. In particular, subsequent to assigning the URL, Weyer teaches a website containing background information of the member, allowing a **user** (*i.e.,* a person) to post comment regarding the member, view map office location of the member, or send email to the member. *See, e.g.,* Weyer col. 11 lines 10-37. Specifically, Weyer does not teach **internet-connected application** retrieving information, such as profile data associated with the individual using http addressing based on the URL name and organizing profile data based on identity identified based on the URL. Therefore, Weyer does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element of the amended independent claim 1.

Further, although RFC 1738 may admittedly describe a file directory path portion of a URL, it does not provide what Weyer lacks. Specifically, RFC 1738 does not describe extracting an identity of an individual based on URL and/or organizing profile data of the individual based on the identity. Therefore, Weyer and RFC 1738, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to disclose all the elements of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent

claim 1 is patentable over Weyer and RFC 1738 for at least the reasons given above. Claims 3-5 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and are therefore patentable over Weyer and RFC 1738 for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, for at least the reasons given above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 7

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weyer in view of RFC 1738, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,158 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Douvikas"). Claims 6 and 7 are cancelled by way of this replay and, therefore, the rejection is now moot with regard to claims 6 and 7. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 12-32 are newly added herein. No new subject matter is added by way of these claims as support for these newly added claims may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0088], [0222]-[0249], [0276]-[0285], [0289]-[0303], [0307]-[0324], [0370]-[0377], and Figures 7-11 of the published version of instant application.

As discussed above, the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1. Claims 26, 28, and 31 include essentially the same limitations as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. New claims 12-25, 27, 29-30, and 32 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 26, 28, and 31 and are thus allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, favorable consideration of claims 12-32 is respectfully requested.

Further, with respect to claims 23, 27, 30, and 32, none of the prior art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests multiple second level domain names for an inputted URL name, as recited in the claims. Weyer and Douvikas merely teach or suggest a contacts management system relying on an existing singular second-level domain that individual's information is to be inputted into that domain; whereas, the recited claims of the present invention are directed to extracting individuals' differing profiles information from multiple second-level domain names to create the contacts. See, for example, Tables 1 (on the top of page 15 of the published version of the instant patent application) and Table 6 (in the middle of page 17 of the published version of the instant patent application), which clearly show that input URL names are of different second level domains and paragraph [0321] (on page 18 of the published version of the instant patent application), which supports that multiple second level domains are inputted. Moreover, RFC 1738 fails to teach or suggest what both Weyer and Douvikas lack because RFC 1738 is only cited to "describe that any URL can have a domain string portion as well as a file directory path portion that points to where specific data is located (see, Office Action dated April 10, 2007 at the bottom of page 9). Accordingly, favorable consideration of claims 23, 27, 30, and 32 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

       Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 32240/004001).

Dated: October 5, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

                           By /Robert P. Lord/
                              Robert P. Lord
                              Registration No.: 46,479
                              OSHA • LIANG LLP
                              1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
                              Houston, Texas 77010
                              (713) 228-8600
                              (713) 228-8778 (Fax)
                              Attorney for Applicant

253125_2